

Abstract

Trends and Patterns of Male Out-Migration from Rural Uttar Pradesh (NSSO Unit Level Analysis)

Migration is often adopted strategy by rural poor to diversify income and risks in less developed economies. In LDCs migration plays very important role in influencing social and economic development. The interrelationship between migration and economy is the relevant area of discussion these days in less developed economies. Uttar Pradesh is one of the largest states of India and unfortunately it is also among few backward states in India in terms of lack of employment opportunities, underdevelopment and poverty. Uttar Pradesh has witnessed enormous increase in out migration (NSSO) in recent era as a result of above-mentioned factors. This paper intends to inquire comprehensively into trends and patterns of male out-migration from rural Uttar Pradesh. Paper employs migration unit level data given by National Sample Survey 64th round (2007-08). To meet the objective, unit level data has been analyzed and tabulated with simple statistical techniques and to find out the determinants of rural male out-migration from Uttar Pradesh, binary logistic regression model has been used. From data analysis the study found that most of the male out-migrants are form the household type self-employed in agriculture and moreover those who are having marginal landholdings. Most of male out- migrations are from eastern region in rural Uttar Pradesh. One of the important finding is that, 70 percent of rural out-migrants male are migrating outside the state. The major destinations of rural male out migrants are Delhi, Maharashtra, Punjab, Haryana, Chandigarh, Gujarat, Uttaranchal and Daman & Diu. Majority of the rural male out-migrants (52.27 percent) belong to OBC category. As per data analysis it is also found that major reason of the rural male out migration is employment oriented and in that highest number of out migration is to take up employment 33.60 percent, followed by in search of better employment (24.99%) and in search of employment (19.8%).

Keywords: Out-Migration, Male, Rural, Employment, Uttar Pradesh, and Risk-Diversification

Section I. Introduction

Migration has become very important area for research in social sciences in current era. It plays very significant role both for sending and receiving destinations. Increased mobility is an indicator of growth and development. Individuals try to seek out job and locations that are best suited to their talents and abilities. The interrelationship between migration and economy is the relevant area of discussion now a days. There are various issues to work upon in migration and related areas from causes of migration, migration trends, impact of out migrants on livelihood, on women left behind, why some move and others don't etc.

Among developing countries, India stands out for its remarkably low levels of occupational and spatial mobility. India lags behind other countries with similar size and economic development in terms of mobility (Munshi & Roseinzweig, 2009).

Thus whether to out-migrate or not is an outcome of many underlying factors such as social, political, individual related etc. The reasons for migration can be divided in pull and push factors. Push factors are those in their old place, which force people to move (Ravesntien 1885). In case of rural to urban migration income differential plays very important role. Migration decisions are not taken only by individual rather is a family decision and family as whole takes decision in migration process (Mincer, 1978).

Despite the fact that lots of study and various works have been undertaken in migration related issues but still there is lot to be done. Because of dearth of proper data and being expensive affair the studies in migration get impeded. Negligible studies have been done in out-migration and related issues in Uttar Pradesh. A probe into literature shows that there are very few studies on out-migration from Uttar Pradesh (Ali 2013; Paris.et.al, 2005; Khan, 1986).The current study will try to fill the void.

It will bring about various trends and patterns of rural male out migrants from Uttar Pradesh and will also try to analyze the determining factors of rural male out-migrants at individual level. Based on the 2001 census, 3.8 million individuals left Uttar Pradesh during the last decade compared to 1.1 million individuals who came to UP (World Bank,2008).

Section I.II. Objectives

- ii) To analyze major trends and patterns and socio-economic characteristics of male out migration from Uttar Pradesh.
- iii) To analyze determinants of Male Out-Migration from rural Uttar Pradesh.

Section I. III. Data and Methodology

The source of data for the study is the NSSO 64th Round (2007-08) given by the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO). This particular round of NSS includes a schedule (10.2) on Employment-unemployment and Migration, which provides information on migration, out-migration as well as other demographic and socio-economic particulars of 572,254 sample household members from all the states. Total number of households in rural Uttar Pradesh are 1,35,407,079, out of which migrant and non-migrant households in rural UP are 34,620,361 and 1,00,786,718 respectively. Total number households in urban area are 35,430,205. Total number of migrant and non-migrant household in urban UP are 11,000,432 and 24,429,773 respectively. Data shows that majority of households belong to rural area in Uttar Pradesh. Total numbers of out migrants in rural area are 20,625,260, out of this male out-migrants are 8,108,727 and female out-migrants are 12,516,533. In urban Uttar Pradesh total number of out-migrants are 3,047,940, in which male out migrants are 928,234 and female out-migrants are 2,119,697. As per the NSSO definition, any former member of a household who left the household any time in the past, for stay outside the village/town was considered as out-migrant provided he/she was alive on date of survey. The focus of the current study is rural male out-migrants from Uttar Pradesh.

NSSO states 70 districts in Uttar Pradesh and dealing with this much number of districts will be quite difficult and also troublesome. Thus to make things easier the analysis of male out migration from those 70 districts study has been analyzed on household type wise given by NSSO itself. Those household types are as follows: i) Self Employed in Non-Agriculture, ii) Agricultural Labors, iii) Other Labors, iv) Self Employed in Agriculture and v) Others.

Reason for further sub-classification of household type Self-employed in agriculture, is on the background that majority of household type in rural Uttar Pradesh belong to this household type and also majority of rural male out migrants are from i.e. 51 percent are from Self-employed in agriculture household type.

Simple frequency tables, cross tabulations and logistic regression model are employed in current paper. In order to find out the determinants and probabilities of out-migration from UP, binary logistic regression model is used. In social sciences, this statistical model can be adopted to explain an event (dependent variable having two responses i.e. 'yes' or 'no') in terms of certain factors (independent or predictor variables or covariates). The dependent variable should be qualitative and dichotomous i.e. having only two responses.

The model can be mathematically represented as:

$$y = \ln \frac{p}{1-p} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_k X_k + e$$

Or,

$$p = \frac{1}{1 + (\exp - (\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_k X_k))} + e \quad \dots\dots\dots (i)$$

where “**Y**” is the dependent variable; “**X**” represents the independent variables having ‘**k**’ covariates in the model.; “**p**” means the probability of occurrence of the event, **Y**(0,1) and “**e**” are the residuals. In our case, the dependent variable **Y** (0,1) has exactly two responses i.e. whether male from rural Uttar Pradesh will out-migrate (1) or not (0). The following covariates have been taken into account, viz. age-groups, sex, marital status, and household size, and religion, social group, monthly per capita household expenditure without remittances, educational attainment, household type, state-region, and relation to head.

The paper is divided in four parts. Part one will be dealing with Introduction, Objectives Data sources and Methodology adopted. Part two will delve in literature on out-migration from Uttar Pradesh and literature on why some move and others don’t. Part three will be dealing with Trends, Patterns and Socio-economic characteristics of male out-migration from rural Uttar Pradesh. Part four will be empirical analysis on determinants of rural male out migration from Uttar Pradesh using logit regression model. Part five will be concluding remark.

Section II. Review of Literature

Current section will disentangle existing literature on out-migration from Uttar Pradesh and literature on why some move and others don’t. Literature shows that there are very few studies on out-migration from Uttar Pradesh. There is dearth of literature on out migrants from Uttar Pradesh. The very few are discussed below.

Majumder (2015), highlights that brick kilns is most often adopted choice of migrants’ labors as survival strategy. The study found that these kind of migration are generally forced and often end up vicious circle of debt.

Ali (2013), analyzed the socio- economic conditions of rickshaw pullers in Aligarh with objectives to assess the arrival and previous occupations. The study found, rickshaw puller

community was migrated, illiterate and poor rural people in majority who spent their nights in poor dwelling where civil amenities are absent.

Raman and Pandey (2012), found interesting fact that the size of non- farm sector is not similar in different states of India or different district of Uttar Pradesh. Study concludes significant role of rural non-farm employment in reducing rural poverty in Uttar Pradesh.

Srivastava (1999), did field study of six gram panchayats during 1993-95 in Muzzafarnagar, Rae Bareilly and Jaunpur districts of Uttar Pradesh and has provided evidence of the strategies pursued by the poorer households and of changes in the economic and social relations between the laboring classes and dominant classes in the study panchayats.

Kumar (2007), analysed the nature of casual contracts prevailing in the rural labour market in regions with diverse socio-economic patterns of development. The most important feature of such a labour market is the growth of "group" labour contracts particularly with in-migrants in Meerut. Paper highlights importance of non-agricultural employment for the labour households and the pattern of diversification of agricultural labour households in Meerut in the form of dairying.

Paris et.al (2005), studied labor out migration from Eastern Uttar Pradesh. The study is based on a case study of labor outmigration of rice farming households in the three districts of eastern Uttar Pradesh. The paper examines the incidence, patterns and impact of labor outmigration on the livelihood of rice farmers and their women left behind and found migration has increased women's decision-making capacity predominantly.

Khan (1986), in her book find out the quantum of outmigration from the sample village. Author has analyzed the characteristics of migrants and compared it with non-migrants in order to find out migrant-non-migrant differential, whether migrants are positively selected or do they show any difference when compared with non-migrant at the places of origin by selecting 20 villages from eastern Uttar Pradesh. It mentions in detail characteristics of out migration from Uttar Pradesh. Author also mentioned that outmigration have been helpful in reducing the dependence on agriculture and helps in diversification of occupation which was not possible in rural areas.

Lanjouw and Stern (1991), in their study in North Indian village of Palanpur mentions that vulnerability is high among low-caste households and those which are involved in agricultural labor.

In another detailed study on village study in Uttar Pradesh, Lanjouw and Stern (1998),

highlights that information networks and ability to pay bribes are important determinants of access to better payments and more attractive non-farm jobs. Study also found that household size and per capita land holding availability is also major determining forces for deciding whether to migrate or not.

World Bank (2008), highlights various socio-economic indicators of Uttar Pradesh and also discussed in detail regional differences within Uttar Pradesh and their underlying causes. Report shows that flow of out-migrants have an over-representation of men. It discusses in detail various trends, characteristics and direction of out-migration from Uttar Pradesh.

Rasul and Eklabya (2014) in their study on Uttar Pradesh and Bihar analyses various underlying causes of poor economic growth of the two states. The analysis reveals that poor economic growth is not due to any particular factor rather is an outcome of a myriad of social, economic and political factors rooted in structural, historical and macro-economic policies such as low human capital, weak institutions and poor infrastructure coupled with political instability and social conflict rooted in sectarian politics based on caste, class and ethnic division.

Diwakar (2009), highlights regional disparities and inequality and causes of backwardness in Uttar Pradesh even after six decades of independence. The basic objective of the paper is to examine whether micro-level disparities and deprivations are much wider and are more alarming than at aggregate level and whether region specific, district level planning needs to address these issues on a priority basis.

The next question is what makes people migrate from one place to another? The current section why some prefer mobility while others don't, even if they can reap good benefits from migration. Current section will highlights some explanations on why migration is chosen by some and not all in same given context and time. Many work have been done to analyze migration and its determinants. Whether to allow migration or not is result of many underlying factors on part of households.

Researchers like Kingsley Davis have attributed low migration in Indian subcontinent to the prevalence of caste system, joint families, traditional values, diversity of language and culture, lack of education and predominance of agriculture and semi-feudal land relations (Davis, 1951). Though majority of the in migration is witnessed by Delhi, Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Haryana, not all net out-migrating states are poor states, a notable example is Kerala that is

socially and educationally most developed state of India but still one of the major out migrating state to gulf (Kannan & Hari, 2002).

Studies by Bhagat (2011), mentioned several reasons why migration doesn't takes place or push factors are effective such as low level of education and skill of rural population combined with high cost of living in cities, lack of squatting places where poor can encroach, hostile city government including judiciary towards the poor who seek roof over the heads in slums. Human capital, endowments, education, skills, age , marital status, gender, occupation and labor markets status as well as preferences and expectations strongly affects who migrates and who don't (Kurekova,2010;Skeldon,1997)). Taylor and Wyatt (1996), mentions that poorer households will face the most severe capital and risk constraints thus have large incentives to send member abroad but high costs, poor information, and uncertainties discourage poorer households from sending their family members abroad in Mexico.

Katz and stark (1986), in their paper have questioned the pioneering work of Todaro, which states that rural to urban labor migration in LDCs is response to higher urban expected income. They state that even if urban expected income is lower than rural income rural to urban labor migration is perfectly fine. Migration by family is warranted when it facilitates reduction in familial risk via diversification of earning resources.

Stark (1984) mentions that those who stay behind are the ones who were not relatively deprived before migration and will not become deprived after it. Thus relative deprivation in origin reference group is very important to decide whether to migrate or not. Author mentions that migration is not from the poorest villages rather migration is highest from the villages where the distribution of income by size is more unequal and from these village sits the very poor whose propensity to migrate is highest.

Rosenzweig and Stark (1989), mentions that a significant proportion of migration in low-income countries, particularly in rural areas is composed of moves by women for the purpose of marriage. Marital arrangement among Indian households can explain these mobility patterns. The study from South Indian village data also found that marriage cum migration contributes significantly to reduction in food variability of household food consumption and provide insurance to household.

Malmberg (1997), portrays the absence of migration as the result of sedentrism. Most people prefer to stay at home which explains why only 3 percent of the world's population are international migrants. However this argument does not seem particularly convincing when

considering the increasing number of studies that point to the significance of motilities and flows in contemporary and past human life ranging across movements and circulation of people (tourists, migrants, refugees, pilgrims) etc. (Jonsson, 2011). Moreover Malmbergs sedentary logic certainly does not explain the absence of migration in transnational and nomadic context, where mobility is normal and desirable. Another thing he assumed that migrants uproots oneself from one's home; studies show (Mannan & Fredrichs, 2015., Taylor, 1999) that how migrants maintain close ties and reciprocal relations with their families and communities in their place of origin.

Migration takes place in presence of imperfection in markets. Where formal insurance is unavailable or expensive migration by one household member is a means of protecting income or consumption stability where risk is not covariant between sending and receiving localities and income sources (Morduch 1995; Waddington 2003; Stark 1985; Taylor 1999).

Study by Crolerees & Abdulai (2001), found that poorer households have fewer opportunities in non-cropping activities such as livestock rearing and non-farm work, and hence less diversified incomes. This appears to reflect their relative lack of capital, which makes it difficult for them to diversify away from subsistence agriculture. Another major finding was that landholding had a large positive impact on its participation in non-farm activities.

Another major reason for not moving out despite of considering migration as profitable household activity, is poverty. Poorer households are not able to overcome entry costs of moving abroad and fall back on migration with low entry costs and low return (i.e. domestic migration), which doesn't help them to achieve production enhancements and may lock them into persistent poverty (Mendola, 2004).

Another major determinant is social networks. Social networks acts as facilitator of migration by reducing transfer costs but at same time act as entry barriers at some places when it is caste, gender, creed, race or location biased. Information about destination is channeled to prospective migrants through those who have already made the journey (Haug,2008; Krug,G & Rebein,2012).

Whether to migrate or not also is a response to the inability to subsist due to the deterioration of the sustainability of the agro-resource base, or indebtedness, or lack of food security (Gill 2003; Adhikari 2001). De Haan (2000), found that migrants in Bihar, India, migrated to reduce the uncertainty of family income, provide investment funds, and livelihoods for those with small plots. Similar findings are reported of households in rural Andhra Pradesh

(Dev et al.2002). In Cameroon, Schrider and Knerr (2000) find evidence that migration is social security mechanism for smaller households in Cameroon.

Family size also plays crucial role in migration decisions (Rogaly 2003).Demurger et al. (2010) in their study mentioned about how China has brought opportunities to diversify both within farm activities and off farm activities. The study found that land availability stimulates on farm diversification. Local off farm activities are mostly driven by household assets position and working resources but migration decisions strongly depend on the household size and composition.

Education and skill level also play vital role in migration decisions (Lucas, 2007; Konsiega, 2005). There are various studies that mentions majority of poor migrants remit money to support consumption in sending household to meet basic needs (Asfar, 2000; Rogaly 2003).Those households whose basic needs are met with available resources probably will not give a thought to out-migrate as their subsistence level is achieved with given income.

Families that are slightly less poor and somewhat more food-secure migrate less often with the whole family, they send out young men, for relatively short periods and short distance, and combine migration with agricultural work in home village. Whereas the poorest migration is option for last resort, and often a reaction to indebtedness, those who are less destitute use migration as a means to reduce vulnerability and for some investment in agriculture (Haan, 2000 ; Waddington 2003).

Roseinzweig and Munshi (2009), in their paper examined the hypothesis that there is persistence of low spatial and marital mobility in rural India, despite increased growth rates. Rising inequality in recent years is due to the existence of sub caste networks that provide mutual insurance to their members.

Bhagat (2011), in his study mentions that migration in India had been low because of various reasons such as caste system, joint families, traditional value, diversity of language and culture, lack of education, and predominance of agriculture , high cost of living, hostile city environment etc.

From literature we can say that migration is very diverse phenomenon. Migrants have different and sometimes changing motivations for moving, which may depend on their cultural background, political circumstances, their personal aspirations, life stage and gender etc. The complex interaction between the motivations that drive migration means that these processes cannot easily be reduced to a few, narrow policy categories.

Section III. Trends and Patterns of Rural Male-Out Migration from Uttar Pradesh

This section will highlight trends and patterns of rural male out-migration from Uttar Pradesh. It will also give an insight on socio-economic characteristics of rural male out-migrants from Uttar Pradesh.

Section III.I Trends and Patterns of Rural Male Out-Migrants from Uttar Pradesh

Table 1 shows total number of out migrants from rural Uttar Pradesh and rate of out migration for rural male and female. Rate of out migration has been defined as number of out migrants per thousand of persons. From Table.1 it is clear that large number of population is engaged in agriculture but majority of the persons in that category belong to household having marginal land holding size. For current study marginal landholding size are those having land below .005 to 1 hectare, small landholding size is 1to 2 hectares. Semi-medium land holding size is equivalent to 2.0 to 4.0 hectares and those having more than 4 to 6 hectares are medium and those who are having land 6 hectares and above are considered to have large holding size.

Table.1 highlights in case of rural male and female out migrants, out migration rate for female is higher than out migration rate of male. Out migration rate for self-employed in agriculture, agricultural labors, other labors, others and self-employed in agriculture for rural males are 68, 69, 46, 277 and 134 per thousand persons respectively. Among all household types out migration rate for rural male is highest in others household type. After further analyzing self-employment in agriculture it shows that out migration rate is highest for those having medium and large size land holdings followed by marginal and small land holdings. Over all out migration rate for rural male out migrants from Uttar Pradesh is 116 per thousand persons. In case of female rural out migrants' highest rate of out migration is from household type others and in self-employed in agriculture household type again highest rate of out migration is from those having medium and large landholding size. Overall rate of out migration from rural female out migrants are 191 per thousand persons.

In male out migration household type self-employed in agriculture are having highest number of out migrants i.e. 59 percent followed by household type others. In self-employed in agriculture too households who have marginal landholding size are the ones with highest number of out migrants. In case of female out migration highest out migration is again from household type self-employed in agriculture followed by self-employed in non-agriculture and others.

Table.2 highlights male and female out migration from urban areas of Uttar Pradesh. Highest numbers of male and female out migrants are from household type self-employed in urban areas followed regular wage salary earning. Total numbers of out migrants from Uttar Pradesh from urban areas are 3, 04,940 out of which total number of male out migrants are 928,243 and of female out migrants are 2,119,697. Table 1 and table 2 shows that male out migration is very high from rural area in comparison to male out migration from urban areas.

Table.2 also mentions about rate of out migration for both male and female in urban areas in Uttar Pradesh. From above Table.1 we can see that rate of out migration for both male and female are high in rural Uttar Pradesh in comparison to urban Uttar Pradesh. In case of urban Uttar Pradesh, we can see from Table.2 that for male rate of out migration is 50 per thousand persons and for female it is 126 per thousand persons. Again female rate of out migration is very high in comparison to male rate of out migration in urban Uttar Pradesh as well. Highest rate of out migration for male is in household type others i.e. 319 per thousand persons and for female it is household type Regular wage salary earning i.e. 135 per thousand persons.

Table.3 shows the distribution of present place of rural male out migrants from Uttar Pradesh. From table 3 it is clear that present place of stay of rural male out migrants is highest in outside the state category. 70 percent of rural male out migrants are outside the state followed by same state another district i.e. 19 percent. Self-employed in agriculture is again leading household type reporting maximum number of male rural out migrants to other states. We can see that international migration is very low for rural male in Uttar Pradesh i.e. 3.16 percent. Within same district rural out migration is very low in rural male in Uttar Pradesh.

Table 4. Shows rural male out migration from Uttar Pradesh region-wise. Majority of male out-migration from rural Uttar Pradesh is from Eastern region followed by Southern Upper Ganga plains and Central Uttar Pradesh i.e. 61 percent and 14 percent respectively. Least rural male out migration is from region Southern and Northern Upper Ganga Plains.

Table 5. shows top fifteen districts out of seventy districts with highest rural male out migration. From previous tables we have seen that eastern Uttar Pradesh witness highest male out-migration. UP has been divided in North Upper Ganga Plain, Southern Upper Ganga Plain, Central , Southern and Eastern as per NSS. Eastern part witness 51 percent of total rural male out

migration. Remaining 55 districts witness only 49 percent of total rural male out migration. Leading districts in rural Uttar Pradesh with highest rural male out migration are Azamgarh, Jaunpur, Ghazipur, Gorakhpur, Deoria , Sultanpur, Siddharthanagar and Ballia. Out of top fifteen districts with highest rural male out migration eleven districts are from eastern Uttar Pradesh.

Table 6. Highlights the leading states which are having highest number of male in migrants from rural Uttar Pradesh. Two major destinations for male out migration from Uttar Pradesh are Delhi and Maharashtra. The other major destination are Gujarat, Haryana, Uttaranchal, Chandigarh, Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli .NSSO report shows that Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are leading out migration states and also among top in interstate male out migration.

From **Table 6** we can see that in Delhi, rural area witness less in migration from Uttar Pradesh in comparison to urban counterparts. From total male migrants in Delhi 41 percent of migrants reported their location of last UPR as Uttar Pradesh. 19 percent of migrants are from Delhi itself. 20 percent of migrants reported their last UPR as Bihar. Thus out of total migrants in Delhi 80 percent are from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Delhi itself. Highest numbers of male in migrants in Delhi in both urban and rural areas are from Uttar Pradesh followed by Bihar. In Maharashtra again Uttar Pradesh has highest number of in migrants followed by Gujarat. Maharashtra is another top destination for out migrants from Uttar Pradesh. Out of total migrants most of the in migrants are form Maharashtra itself i.e. 82 percent. Rest of other states account only for 18 percent in migration to Maharashtra. In that 18 percent 6 percent migrants are from Uttar Pradesh itself and 1 percent from Bihar.

Table 7. Highlights districts in rural Uttar Pradesh with highest male out migration to other countries. 85 percent out of country out-migration is from ten districts (eastern) in Uttar Pradesh. Remaining fifteen percent of total rural male out migration is from other 60 districts. Deoria, Azamgarh, Kushinagar , Basti and Sultanpur are leading districts for rural male out migration to other country.

Section III.II. Socio-Economic Characteristics of Male Out-Migrants from Rural Uttar Pradesh

After having basic idea about major trends and patterns of male out migration from rural Uttar Pradesh, current section deals with socio-economic characteristics of male out migration such as

reason for migration, religion, education, marital status, land holding size, social group, household size etc.

Social Groups of rural Male out Migrants

Table 8 highlights the social group of male out migrants. Table 8. Shows that majority of male out migrants are from OBC group i.e. 52 percent out of total male who migrated out from UP followed by Others i.e. 24 percent and SC group i.e. 23 percent.

Religion of rural Male Out-Migrants

Table 9. shows that majority of male out migrants are of Hindu religion followed by Islam. Thus it can be said that male out migration from rural UP is dominated by Hindu religion followed by Islam.

Land possessed by Rural Male Out-Migrants from UP

Table 10. Highlights the land possessed by rural male out migrants from UP. Majority of rural male out migrants possess land less than 1 hectare i.e. 74 percent followed by 1-2 hectares i.e. 13 percent. The irony that Table 10 is highlighting is that out of total male out migrants from rural area in UP are from household types self-employed from agriculture i.e. 59 percent, and they are the ones with agriculture as main occupation at origin and majority of them are having less than 1 hectare land. Only 0.2 percent of male out migrants from rural UP have land holding size more than 8 hectares.

Reasons for Migration

From **Table.11** it can be said that major reason for out-migration of rural male from UP is employment related out-migration. Majority of the out migrants migrated out to take up employment i.e. 37 percent followed by In search of better employment i.e. 25 percent and In search of employment i.e. 20 percent. Only 4 percent of the rural male out migrants migrated out for study purpose. Only 20 percent of migrants moved in search of employment. 33 percent migrated to take up employment in some sense highlights the role of social networks in out migration from UP. 9 percent of migrants also migrated because of migration of parents or earning member of family.

Table 12. Shows the educational attainment of rural male out migrants in Uttar Pradesh according to their HHType, Social group and Region in Uttar Pradesh to which they belong. HHType wise from Table it can be seen that majority of male out-migrants from rural Uttar

Pradesh are illiterate i.e.57percent.Lowest percentage of illiterates among all household is self-employed in agriculture i.e. 53 percent. Highest number of illiterates are in HHType Agricultural labors. Below primary are only 6 percent in entire population of rural male out migrants from Uttar Pradesh.10 percent of rural male out-migrants are having educational attainment up to upper primary and middle. Secondary education is attained by only 6 percent of male out migrants from rural Uttar Pradesh. The percentage of graduates and post graduates are only 2 and 1 percent in total population of male out migrant. HHType Agricultural labors and Other labors are more into not literate category. In category below primary to secondary HHType Self-employed in non-agriculture, Self-employed in agriculture and Others are better than HHType Agricultural labor and Other labors.

In terms of Social group highest number of illiterates are in the households which belongs to Scheduled caste category i.e. 70 percent followed by Other backward caste i.e 62 percent. Lowest numbers of illiterate are in Others category i.e. 31 percent followed by Schedule Tribes category i.e. 39 percent. In higher educational attainment as well Others category is high for Social Group Others followed by Others category. Highest percentage of graduates and postgraduates are in Others category i.e. 6 and 3 percent respectively.

In terms of Region-wise analysis, illiterates are highest in Central region i.e. 59 percent followed by Eastern region followed by 58 percent. Region having lowest number of illiterates are Southern i.e. 43 percent. In another educational category as well Southern region is comparatively better than other region. Lowest number of Graduates and Post-graduates are in Eastern region. Secondary level education and higher secondary level education is also lowest in Eastern region of Uttar Pradesh.

Table 13. shows the number/size of household members of rural male out-migrants in Uttar Pradesh. Highest number of male out-migration is from households which are having 1-3, 4-7, 8-11 members i.e. 25 percent, 50 percent and 17 percent respectively. For each HHType percentage share of male out migration except HHType others is increasing with increase in household number from 3-7 but after that percentage share of out migrants is declining.

Eastern Uttar Pradesh has major share in out migration. Literature reveals that eastern Uttar Pradesh is backward and underdeveloped region in Uttar Pradesh.The poor performance of Uttar Pradesh may be attributed to low human capital, weak institutions and poor infrastructure

coupled with political instability and social conflict rooted in sectarian politics based on caste, class and ethnic decision (Rasul and Eklabya, 2014).

Majority of rural male are from household type self-employed in agriculture. Though majority of households are engaged in agriculture as their main source of income but are having marginal land holdings. Thus high rural male out migration can be attributed to less income in agriculture because of marginal size of land holdings. Another reason for out migration of male from Uttar Pradesh is because of lack of development and lack of employment opportunities in Eastern Uttar Pradesh.

Section IV. Empirical Analysis of Determinants of Male Out-Migration from Uttar Pradesh

$$P(Y=1)=\beta_0+\beta_1(\text{Age of Rural Male})+ \beta_2(\text{Marital Status}) + \beta_3(\text{Relation to Head})+ \beta_4(\text{Religion})+ \beta_5(\text{Household Type})+ \beta_6(\text{State-Region})+ \beta_7(\text{Land Possessed})+ \beta_8(\text{Educational Attainment})+ \beta_9(\text{Household Size})+ \beta_{10}(\text{Social Group})+ \beta_{11}(\text{MPCE without Remittances}) + u_i \dots\dots\dots (ii)$$

Where Y is dependent variable and is decision to out-migrate or not to out-migrate by rural male in Uttar Pradesh. It has binary values, to out-migrate=1 and not to out-migrate=0. Set of independent or explanatory variables are Age, Marital Status, Relation to Head, Household Type, State-Region, Land Possessed, Educational Attainment, Household Size, Social Group and MPCE without Remittances and *ui* random or stochastic error term.

The findings of the logistic regression models on the *determinants of rural male out-migration* are as follows. All the considered covariates, viz. age (15-50), marital status, household size, social group, religion, relation to head, monthly per capita expenditure without remittances, educational attainment, Household Types, land possessed, state-region are found to be highly significant. . For Monthly per capita expenditure without remittances. Further to get MPCE without remittances for rural male out migration following steps have been followed. Monthly consumption expenditure (MCE) without Remittances = Total MCE – Total Monthly Remittances. Monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) without Remittances=MCE without Remittances/HH Size.

Age of male is negatively related to out migration i.e. as age of male increases out migration decreases but age is highly significant in determining whether to migrate or not. In case of marital status married male have less probability of out migration than unmarried male.

In relation to head rural male who himself is head of the family i.e. Self has more chances of out migration than others. If a male is Hindu he has high probability of out migration compared to other religions. Household type is also significant factor in determining whether to out-migration takes place or not by rural male in Uttar Pradesh. In compared to Self Employed in non-agriculture, agricultural labor and other labors are negatively related whereas self-employed in agriculture and others have more chances of out-migration in comparison to household types self-employed in non-agriculture. Eastern and Southern Upper Ganga plains are highly significant and have more out migration in compared to Northern Upper Ganga plains. Model shows that male belonging to higher land possessed households, have more chance of out migration in comparison to male having less than 1 hectare land.

In case of educational attainment illiterates are out migrating more in comparison to literates but overall, all educational category in education are highly significant. In terms of household size ,male having household size 1-3 are out migrating more in comparison to household size 4-24. Thus though household size is significant factor in determining whether to migrate or not but household size above 12 are not significant in determining whether to migrate or not. MPCE without remittances is negatively related to decision to out migrate i.e. higher the MPCE without remittances lower the probability of out migration by rural male in Uttar Pradesh. Thus MPCE increases chances of out-migration by rural male decreases.

According to the model, male of younger age, especially married males, household members having land more than 1 hectares, and those having lower educational attainment are more likely to out-migrate from UP. Male from Eastern and Southern Upper Ganga Plains, from Self Employed in agriculture and Others Household types are the one who are out migrating more from rural Uttar Pradesh.

Discussion and Conclusion

As already mentioned in previous Tables, majority of male out-migrants are from rural Uttar Pradesh, from Eastern Uttar Pradesh and from self-employed in agriculture and Others household type and with marginal land holding size. This volume of migrants suggest that there are certain issues and challenges faced by the migrants at their place of origin and it might be the case that agricultural income alone is inadequate for meeting basic needs of rural household's thus leading male out-migration from Uttar Pradesh. From data analysis it is clear that majority of out-migration by male in rural Uttar Pradesh is employment related. When employment

related out-migration comes up, there is a question on availability of employment and level of development at origin. Although it doesn't imply that pull factors are not at all accountable for out-migration from rural Uttar Pradesh. Majority of the migrants move to urban centres in economically more developed states/UTs like Delhi, Maharashtra, Punjab, Gujarat etc. in which city lights and glitters provide employment opportunities either in formal or informal sector and attract in-migrants.

Most of the male out-migrants are illiterates. Hence, absence of education and technical proficiencies restraint and limit the migrants' employment opportunities at destinations and make them to work in unorganized informal sector. Without having good knowledge of the employment state of affairs in the destinations, prospective migrants just move out of their homes having pushed by unemployment and lack of capital.

Uttar Pradesh is primarily agricultural State with majority of its population living in rural areas and having huge dependence on agriculture directly or indirectly. But weak agrarian status of Uttar Pradesh is forcing people to out-migrate from rural areas. Poor economic and physical infrastructure further amplify the poor state of rural Uttar Pradesh leading more out-migration. Lack of private and public investment further adds to prevailing problem of unemployment and underdevelopment. Poor functioning of institutions and bad governance unfavorably hampers economic growth and development of Uttar Pradesh. Bihar and UP are rated as the most poorly governed states of India (World Bank, 2005). Above mentioned conditions are more pathetic in Eastern UP and Bundelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh and are comparatively better in Western and Central Uttar Pradesh.

Huge mass labor migrants in cities like Delhi, Mumbai etc. put pressure on local and public amenities and subsequently lead to prevalence of slums thereby. Thus out-migration cannot be seen from origin perspective only rather destination associated pros and cons should also be taken into consideration while dealing with migration and related aspects. Thus out-migration cannot be only solution from running away from prevailing unemployment and underdevelopment scenario in Eastern and Southern Uttar Pradesh, rather more government policies should be introduced offering employment opportunities to huge youth population at UP and there is also severe need to reinforce the existing employment schemes and their execution in UP followed by skill development programmes.

References

- Abdulai, A., & CroleRees, A. 2001. Determinants of Income Diversification amongst Rural Households in Southern Mali. *Food policy*, 26(4):437-452.
- Adhikari., J. 2001. The Role of Mobility and Remittances in Diversifying the Livelihood Opportunities in Rural Nepal, Department for International Development Asia Regional Livelihoods Workshop: Reaching the Poor, 8-10 May, 2001.
- Alam Rukhsana and Asraful Alam. 2013. Socio - Economic Analysis of Van-Rickshaw Puller (Manual) In Rural Areas-A Case Study. 2013. *Indian Streams Research Journal*. 3(11):1-5.
- Ali M. 2013. Socio-Economic Analysis of Rickshaw Pullers in Urban Centres: A Case study of Uttar Pradesh, India. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*. 2(1):98-109.
- Afsar, R. 2003. Internal Migration and the Development Nexus: The Case of Bangladesh. In *Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia: 22-24*.
- Bhagat, R B. 2011. Internal Migration in India: Are the Underclass More Mobile? *Asia Pacific Population Journal*, 25(1):27-46.
- Davis, K. 1968. Population of India and Pakistan.
- De Haan, A. 2000. Migrants, Livelihoods, and Rights: The Relevance of Migration in Development Policies. Social Development Working Paper No .4. London: Department for International Development.
- Demurger, Sylvie., Martin Fournier and Weiyong Yang. 2010. Rural Households' Decisions Towards Income Diversification: Evidence from North China. *China Economic Review*. Volume 21(1): 32-44.
- Diwakar, D. M. 2009. Intra-Regional Disparities, Inequality and Poverty in Uttar Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 264-273.
- Dev, M.S., Galab, S., Gopinath, R.M., Reddy, K.S., Ravi, C., Babu, K.S. and Mitra, G.K. 2002. APDPIP Baseline Survey Report in Sustainable Livelihood Framework, Hyderabad: Centre for Economic and Social Studies.
- Gill, G. 2003. Seasonal Labour Migration in Rural Nepal: A Preliminary Overview. Overseas Development Institute Working Paper No. 218, London: ODI.
- Golam Rasul & Eklabya Sharma. 2014. Understanding the Poor Economic Performance of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, India: a Macro-Perspective, *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 1:1, 221-239,
- Government of India .2007. Uttar Pradesh Development Report. New Delhi: Government of India Planning Commission, Development Report Series, Academic Foundation.
- Haug, Sonja. 2008. Migration Networks and Migration Decision-Making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(4): 585-605.
- Jónsson, G. 2011. Non-migrant, Sedentary, Immobile, or 'Left Behind'? *International Migration Institute (Working Paper 39)*. Oxford: International Migration Institute.
- Kannan, K. P., & Hari, K. S. 2002. Kerala's Gulf Connection: Emigration, Remittances and Their Macroeconomic Impact, 1972-2000.
- Katz, Eliakim and Oded Stark. 1986 ,Labor Migration and Risk Aversion in Less Developed Countries. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 4(1): 134-149.
- Khan , Nazma. 1986. *Pattern of Rural Out-migration (Micro Level Study)*. B.R .Publishing Corporation . Delhi.
- Konseiga, Adama. 2005. Household Migration Decisions as Survival Strategy: The Case of

- Burkina Faso. Discussion Paper No. 1819. The Institute of Study of Labour (IZA) .Bonn.
- Krug, G., & Rebein, M. 2012. Network based Job Search: An Analysis of Monetary and Non-Monetary Labor Market Outcomes for the Low-Status Unemployed. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 41(4):316-333.
- Kurekova, Lucia. 2010. Theories of Migration: Critical Review in The Context of the EU East-West flows. *CARIM AS Best Participant Essays Series*, 44.
- Lanjouw, P., & Stern, N. (1991). Poverty in Palanpur. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 23-55.
- Lanjouw, P., & Stern, N. (1998). Economic development in Palanpur over five decades. *OUP Catalogue*.
- Lucas, R.E.B. 1997. Internal Migration in Developing Countries, in M.R. Rosenzweig and O. Stark, eds.: *Handbook of Family and Population Economics*, Amsterdam, North Holland. Chapter 13, 1(B): 721-98.
- Majumder, Bhaskar. 2015. Forced Migration of Labourers to Brick Kilns in Uttar Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly. Review of Rural Affairs* (26,27):19-26.
- Malmberg, G. 1997. 'Time and Space in International Migration', in T. Hammar, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas and T. Faist (eds.), *International Migration, Immobility and Development*, Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Mannan, K. A., & Fredericks, L. J. 2015. Determinants and Socioeconomic impact of Remittances between Bangladesh and Italy: A Multivariate Analysis of Religion of Rural Households. *International Research Journal of Business and Social Science*.
- Mendola, Mariapia. 2004. Migration and Technological Change in Rural Households: Complements or Substitutes? *Development Studies Working Papers*. University of Milan-Bicocca and Centro Studi Luca d'Angliano.
- Mincer, Jacob. 1978. Family Migration Decisions. *Journal of Political Economy* 86(5):749-773.
- Munshi, Kaivan, and Mark Rosenzweig. 2009. *Why is Mobility in India so Low? Social Insurance, Inequality, and Growth*. NBER Working Paper No. 14850. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Munshi K. 2003. Networks in the Modern Economy: Mexican migrants in US. *Labour Market, Quarterly Journal of Economic*. 2(118).
- Morduch, J. 1995. Income Smoothing and Consumption smoothing. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 103-114.
- NSSO, MoSPI. Migration in India 2007-8, NSS 64th Round Report No. 533.
- Paris, T., Singh, A., Luis, J., & Hossain, M. 2005. Labour Outmigration, Livelihood of Rice Farming Households and Women Left Behind: A Case Study in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2522-2529.
- Rajni, V. 2007. Casual Labour Contracts of Agricultural Labourers in East and West Uttar Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 154-160.
- Raman, R., & Pandey, A. 2012. Rural Non-Farm Economy in India: A Study of Uttar Pradesh. *Jurnalul Practicilor Comunitare Pozitive*, (2):222-239.
- Ravenstein, Ernest George. 1885. The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 48(2):167-235.
- Rogaly, B. 2003. Who Goes? Who Stays Back? Seasonal Migration and Staying Put Among Rural Manual Workers in Eastern India. *Journal of International Development* 15, 1-10.
- Rosenzweig, Mark, R., & Oded Stark. 1989. Consumption Smoothing, Migration, and Marriage: Evidence from Rural India. *Journal of Political Economy*, (97):905-926.

- Schrieder, G., Knerr, B. 2000. Labour Migration as a Social Security Mechanism for Smallholder Households in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Cameroon. *Oxford Development Studies* 28(2): 223-236.
- Skeldon R.1997.*Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*. Essex: Longman.
- Srivastava, R. S.1999. Rural Labour in Uttar Pradesh: Emerging Features of Subsistence, Contradiction and Resistance. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 26(2-3):263-315
- Stark, Oded.1984. Discontinuity and the Theory of International Migration.,*Kyklos*, 37(2):206-222.
- Stark, Oded.1984. Rural to Urban Migration in LDCs: A Relative Deprivation Approach, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*.32:475-486.
- Taylor, J. E. 1999. The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittances in the Migration Process. *International Migration* 37(1): 63-88.
- Taylor, J. E., & Wyatt, T. J. 1996. The Shadow Value of Migrant Remittances, Income and Inequality in a Household-Farm Economy. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 32(6):899-912.
- Waddington, H., & Sabates-Wheeler, R.2003. How does Poverty affect Migration Choice? A Review of Literature. *Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalization and Poverty-University of Sussex, Brighton*.
- World Bank.2008.Living Conditions and Human Development in Uttar Pradesh: A Regional Perspective, Discussion Draft Report No. 43573-IN.
- World Bank 2007. Moving out of Poverty: Uttar Pradesh, World Bank, Washington DC.

Tables

Table 1: Out-Migration of Male and Female from Rural Uttar Pradesh

HH Type	Total Rural Population		Out migration Rate Per Thousand		Percentage of Rural Out-Migrants		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Rural Male Out-Migration	Rural Female Out-Migration	Total Rural Out Migrants (Male and Female)
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture (1)	11,162,823	10,301,601	68	143	34	66	100
Agricultural Labors(2)	10,863,742	9,823,602	69	125	38	62	100
Other Labors(3)	6,619,806	5,831,553	46	165	24	76	100
Others(4)	5,525,886	6,248,959	277	244	50	50	100

Self-Employed in Agriculture	35,733,799	33,295,308	134	219	39	61	100
Marginal(5)	23,293,770	22,111,642	142	210.9	41	59	100
Small(6)	8,132,398	7,314,118	120	204	39	61	100
Semi-medium(7)	3,429,493	3,076,693	98	273	29	71	100
Medium and large(8)	878,138	792,855	183	402	33	67	100
Total	69,906,056	65,501,023	116	191	39	61	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 2: Out-Migration of Male and Female from Urban Uttar Pradesh Sex-wise

HH Type	Percent Share of Male and Female		Total Urban Population		Rate of Out Migration per Thousand person	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Self Employed	25	75	9,686,373	9,035,391	36	117
Regular Wage Salary earning	26	74	6,005,165	5,189,236	41	135
Casual Labors	28	73	2,038,599	1,707,051	31	97
Others	58	42	847,711	1,707,051	319	113
Total	30	70	18,577,848	16,852,357	50	126

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 3: Present Place of Stay of Rural Male Out-migrants from Uttar Pradesh

In Percentage

HH TYPE	Present Place of Stay (Male Out-Migrants from Uttar Pradesh)					Total
	Same state		Outside the	Another	Not	
	Within same District	Another District	State	Country	Known	
Self-employed in Non-	8	16	72	3	1	100

Agriculture(1)						
Agricultural labours(2)	8	17	73	1	1	100
Other labours(3)	12	17	69	0	2	100
Others(4)	8	22	65	4	0	100
Self-employed in Agriculture	8	18	71	3	0	100
Percentage of Present Place of Stay	8	19	70	3	0	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008).

Table 4. HHType-wise Rural Male Out-Migration from Uttar Pradesh from various Regions (In Percentage)

Regions of Uttar Pradesh	Northern Upper Ganga Plain	Central	Eastern	Southern	Southern Upper Ganga Plains	Total
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	6	11	62	6	15	100
Agricultural Labors	7	12	57	5	19	100
Other Labors	8	19	56	6	10	100
Self-Employed in Agriculture	4	12	66	6	13	100
Others	11	18	49	7	15	100
Total	6	13	61	6	14	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008).

Table 5: Leading districts of Rural Out-Migration Male

Top Fifteen Districts with Highest Rural Out -Migration Male (Percentage Share)										
S.No.	Districts	Self Employed in Non-Agriculture	Percent share	Agricultural Labours	Percent share	Other Labours	Percent share	Self Employed in Agriculture	Percent share	Others
1	Azamgarh	80,053	11%	42,364	6%	22097	7%	280,961	6%	23,066

2	Jaunpur	53,207	7%	47,066	6%	8,066	3%	256,960	5%	40,440
3	Ghazipur	11,657	2%	20,741	3%	4,414	1%	246,346	5%	43,818
4	Gorakhpur	17,165	2%	29,832	4%	21,195	7%	191,114	4%	67,237
5	Deoria	58,344	8%	9,350	1%	15,310	5%	157,931	3%	70,191
6	Sultampur	33,714	4%	7,113	1%	0	0%	186,928	4%	66,832
7	Siddhartagar	20,825	3%	19,560	3%	787	0%	192,745	4%	26,947
8	Ballia	15,767	2%	9,946	1%	21,821	7%	182,510	4%	25,847
9	Rae-Bareilly	15,306	2%	20,799	3%	3,662	1%	141,666	3%	65,982
10	Sant Kabir Nagar	7,014	1%	15,253	2%	10,516	3%	191,854	4%	19,275
11	Kushinagar	16,283	2%	13,510	2%	5,930	2%	171,975	4%	12,608
12	Pratapgarh	9,595	1%	29,363	4%	825	0%	115,943	2%	49,902
13	Unnao	26,080	3%	10,732	1%	5,376	2%	92,848	2%	66,820
14	Allahabad	20,359	3%	47,477	6%	8,306	3%	109,001	2%	16,441
15	Maharajganj	10,029	1%	6,182	1%	1,353	0%	141,189	3%	22,862
	Total (1-15)	395,398	53%	329,288	44%	129,658	43%	2,659,971	56%	618,268
	Uttar Pradesh	753,016	100%	749,679	100%	301,172	100%	4,773,269	100%	1,531,591

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008).

Table 6: States with Highest Number of Male In-Migrants from Uttar Pradesh

States with highest Number of migrants reporting Uttar Pradesh as Location of LAST UPR Male									
		Delhi		UP	Maharashtra		UP	Haryana	
		Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban
Uttar Pradesh	1	94,693	1,269,608	UP	59,584	1,036,830	UP	63,120	175,107
	41%	1,364,301		1	1,096,414 (6%)		6% (1)	238,227	

Delhi		42,4 65	603,2 95	Maharashtra	8,99 6,76 0	5,849,154	Haryana	1,95 4,16 2	640, 684
	19 %	645,760		82%	14,845,914		70%	2,594,846	
Bihar	2	26,9 31	649,3 55	Bihar	18,4 06	170,855	Bihar (2)	10,5 60	161, 251
	20 %	676,286		1 %	189,261		0.04 %	171,811	
		190, 705	3,135, 078		9,40 4,47 7	8,799,387		2428 277	126 607 4
Total (Delhi)		3,325,783		Maharashtra (Total)	18,203,864		Total (Haryana)	3,694,351	
		Punjab			Gujarat			Uttaranchal	
		Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban
UP	(1)	49,6 74	276,3 48	UP (1)	9109 3	406,828	UP	154, 931	256, 986
	7.50 %	326,022		6 %	497,921		25% (1)	411,917	
Punjab	72 %	2,22 5,96 7	941,7 52	Gujarat	7,279.511		Uttaranchal	896, 132	191, 618
		3,167,719		84 %	4,67 5,78 5	2,603,726	66%	1,087,750	
Bihar	2	62,2 49	212,2 41	Bihar	79,4 43	78,974	Bihar	24,6 30	28,6 53
	6.32 %	274,490		1.8 %	158,417		3.12 %	53,288	
Total (Punjab)		2,63 9,19 6	1,700, 642	Gujarat (Total)	4,96 8,95 3	3,723,379	Uttaranchal (Total)	1,13 1,40 9	524, 579
		4,339,838			8,692,332			1,655,988	
		Daman & Diu		Dadar & N Haveli		Chandigarh			
		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban		Rural	Urban	
UP(2, 1 Gujarat))	74 42	1,25 8	UP (1)	9,475	2,62 4	UP(1)	10,806	67,9 23	
20%		8,700	25%	12,099		29%		78,7 27	

Dadar & Diu	69 56	1,44 2	D&N Haveli	15,454	539	Chandigarh (Punjab)	2,225	50,9 57
20%	8,398		33%	15,993		11.9 %	53,182	
Bihar	50 64	154	Bihar	1831	1553	Bihar	13,624	13,55 4
12.27%	5218		7 %	3,384		5.7%	27,178	
Total (D&N Haveli)	34, 44 3	8,08 3		38,278	10,2 87	Total Chandigarh	33,430	237, 518
	42,526		Total	48,565			475,036	

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 7. Out Migration to other countries

Leading Districts with rural male out migration to Other Countries			
	Districts	Rural male out migrants	Percentage
1	Deoria	47,263	18.42626
2	Azamgarh	34,518	13.45741
3	Kushinagar	34,240	13.34903
4	Basti	27,316	10.6496
5	Sultanpur	19,290	7.520526
6	Ballia	16,996	6.626173
7	Ghazipur	14,777	5.761059
8	Mahrajganj	8,895	3.467863
9	Gorakhpur	8,050	3.138426
10	Jaunpur	6,814	2.656551
85%	Total 1-10)	218,159	85.0529
	Total	256,498	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 8. Social Groups of Rural Male out -Migrants from Uttar Pradesh Household Type Wise (In Percentge)

HH Type (Rural)	Social Group (Rural Male Out-Migrants)				
	ST	SC	OBC	Others	Total
Self Employed in Non-Agri(1)	1	15	69	15	100
(Agricultural	0	56	40	3	100

Labours)2					
(Other Labour) 3	2	62	33	3	100
Others (4)	0	31	43	27	100
Self Employed in Agri	0	14	56	30	100
Marginal (5)	0	19	58	23	100
Small (6)	0	6	61	33	100
Semi-Medium (7)	0	2	32	66	100
Medium and Large (8)	0	0	30	69	100
Total	0	23	52	24	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 9. Religion of Rural Male Out-Migrants from Uttar Pradesh Household Type Wise (In Percentage)

HH Type (Rural)	Religion (Rural Male Out-Migrants)							Others
	Hinduism	Islam	Christianity	Sikhism	Jainism	Buddhism	Zoroastrianism	
Employed in Non-Agri(1)	75	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural Labours)2	88	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
(Other Labour) 3	85	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others (4)	82	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employed in Agri	90	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal (5)	89	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small (6)	94	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Semi-Medium (7)	95	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium and Large (8)	94	6	0	1	0	0	0	0
1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8)	87	13	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 10. Land Possessed by Rural Male Out-Migrants Household Type Wise from Uttar Pradesh (In Percentage)

Land Possessed Code of Rural Out-Migration (Male)									
HH Type	Less than	0.005-1.0	1.01-2.00	2.01-3.01	3.01-4.01	4.01-6.01	6.01-8.0	< 8	Total

	0.005								
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	8	87	5	0	0	0	0	0	100
Agriculture Labors	12	87	1	0	0	0	0	0	100
Other Labors	12	87	1	0	0	0	0	0	100
Others	18	77	3	0	1	0	0	0	100
Self-Employed in Agriculture	0	69	20	5	2	2	1	0	100
Total	6	74	13	3	2	1	1	0	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 11. Reasons for Migration of Rural Male Out-Migrants Household Type Wise from Uttar Pradesh (In Percentage)

Reasons for Migration of Rural Male Out-Migrants Household Type Wise from Uttar Pradesh									
HHTyp e	In Search of Employment	In Search of Better Employment	Busin ess	To take up Employment /Better Employment	Trans fer of Servic e /Cont ract	Proxi mity to place of Work	Stud ies	Oth ers	Tot al
Self - employe d Non Agricult ure	21	22	4	33	0	0	5	14	100
Agricult ural Labors	27	35	1	30	1	0	1	5	100
Other Labors	23	30	0	28	0	0	6	12	100
Others	18	19	3	42	2	0	6	10	100
Self- Employ ed in Agricult ure	19	26	2	33	2	0	4	14	100
Margin al	23	33	2	33	2	0	3	2	100
Small	17	18	2	38	2	0	4	20	100
Semi medium	13	17	1	44	4	0	12	10	100

Medium n large	3	3	3	23	0	0	23	45	100
Total	20	25	2	34	2	0	4	12	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008).

Table 12. Education of Rural Male Out Migrants –HHType, Social Group and Region wise of Uttar Pradesh in percentage (In Percentage)

General Education														
Categori es	Not Lite rate	Literat e witho ut any School ing	Liter ate with out Form al Scho oling	Liter ate thro ugh TLC /AE C	Oth ers	Be lo w Pri ma ry	Pr i m ar y	Upper Prima ry/Mi ddle	Se co nd ary	Hi gh er sec on dar y	D ip lo m a te	G ra d u ate	P o st - gr a d u ate	Tot al
HHType														
Self- Emplo yed in Non- Agricul ture	56	1	0	0	0	6	12	11	4	5	2	2	1	100
Agricul tural Labors	76	0	0	0	0	7	6	6	2	1	0	0	1	100
Other Labors	72	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4	2	0	0	0	100
Self- Emplo yed in Agricul ture	53	1	0	0	0	7	12	10	7	5	0	3	1	100
Others	56	0	0	0	1	5	12	11	4	5	1	3	1	100
Total	57	1	0	0	0	6	11	10	6	4	1	2	1	100
Social Group														
Sched uled Tribe	39	18	0	0	0	3	4	29	3	1	0	3	0	100
Sched uled Caste	70	0	0	0	0	4	8	8	5	3	0	1	1	100
Other Backwa	62	1	0	0	0	7	11	8	4	3	0	2	1	100

rd Caste														
Others	31	1	0	0	0	7	14	16	11	8	2	6	3	100
Total	57	1	0	0	0	6	11	10	6	4	1	2	1	100
Regions in Rural Uttar Pradesh														
Northern Upper Ganga Plains	57	0	0	0	0	6	10	11	6	3	2	3	2	100
Central	59	1	0	0	0	4	11	10	8	4	1	2	0	100
Eastern	58	1	0	0	0	7	11	9	5	4	0	2	1	100
Southern	43	2	0	0	0	12	13	7	7	8	1	5	2	100
Southern Upper Ganga Plains	53	0	0	1	0	6	10	14	5	5	1	3	1	100
Total	57	1	0	0	0	6	11	10	6	4	1	2	1	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008)

Table 13. Household Size of Rural Male Out-Migrants from Uttar Pradesh (In percentage)

HH Size						
HHType	1-3	4-7	8-11	12-15	15-24	Total
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	20	51	22	7	1	100
Agricultural Labors	29	53	16	1	0	100
Other Labors	24	51	21	4	0	100
Self-Employed in Agriculture	18	53	20	7	2	100
Others	49	40	6	3	1	100
Total	25	50	17	6	1	100

Source: NSSO 64th Round, Schedule 10.2. Employment & Unemployment and Migration Particulars - (July 2007-2008).

Logistic Regression model: Determinants of Rural Male Out Migration from Uttar Pradesh		
Dependent variable:		
Out Migrate=1, No Out-Migration=0		
Statistical method	Logit	
No. of observations	14190	
Log likelihood	-5134.7621	
Prob chi²	0.0000	
Pseudo R²	0.4014	
Explanatory variables	Coefficients	p-value
Age of Male	-0.0996	***0.000

Marital Status		
Unmarried ®		
Married	-2.2407	***0.000
Relation to Head		
Others ®		
Self	2.0786	***0.000
Religion		
Others ®		
Hindu	0.58232	**0.000
Household Types		
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture ®		
Agricultural Labor	-0.3939	***0.000
Other Labor	-0.7845	***0.000
Self-Employed in Agriculture	0.49672	***0.000
Others	0.95697	***0.000
State-Region		
Northern Upper Ganga Plains ®		
Central	0.08822	0.385
Eastern	0.34512	**0.000
Southern	0.18192	0.177
Southern Upper Ganga Plains	0.77104	***0.000
Land Possessed Code (in Hectares)		
Less than 0.005-0.01 ®		
0.02-1.00	0.05079	0.482
1.01-4.00	0.23218	**0.019
4.01-Greater Than 8	0.76634	***0.002
Education Attainment		
Illiterates ®		
Upto Primary	-0.6524	***0.000
Upto Secondary and Diploma Certificates	-1.6699	***0.000
Graduates & Above	-1.7834	***0.000
Household Size		
1-3 ®		
4-7,	-0.4262	***0.000
8-11,	-0.4211	***0.000
12-24,	-0.1746	0.150
Social Group		
Scheduled Tribe ®		
Scheduled Caste	0.40749	0.207
Other Backward Caste	0.49025	0.128
Others	1.15782	***0.000
Monthly Per Capita Expenditure without Remittances	-0.0005	***0.000

®Reference category; ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05 level of significance

Source: NSS 64th (2007-8), schedule 10.2

Appendix Table: Definition and Descriptive Statistics of Used Variables

Variable Name and Definition	Descriptive statistics				
	No. of Observations	Mean	CV	Min	Max
d_Outmigrate: dummy (if Out Migrated=1, if Not Out Migrated=0)	14396	0.30	1.52	0	1
Age of Rural Male	14396	27.60	.349	15	50
MPCE without Remittances	14396	-342.87	-7.90	-69254.00	5026.67
Social Group					
d_Scheduled Tribes ®					
d_Scheduled Castes (if SC=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.25	-	0	1
d_OBC (if OBC=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.55	-	0	1
d_Others (if Others=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.20	-	0	1
Religion					
d_Other Religion (Islam,Christianity,Sikhism,Jainism,Budhism,Zoroastrianism,Others ®)					
d_Hindu (if Hindu=1, Rest =0)	14396	.85	-	0	1
Household Types					
d_Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture ®					
d_Agricultural Labor (if Agricultural Labor=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.14	-	0	1
d_Other Labors (if Other Labors=1 Rest=0)	14396	0.09	-	0	1
d_Self-Employed in Agriculture (if Self-Employed in Agriculture=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.52	-	0	1
d_Others (if Others=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.10	-	0	1
State-Region					
d_Northern Upper Ganga Plains ®					
d_Central (if Central=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.14	-	0	1
d_Eastern (if Eastern=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.42	-	0	1
d_Southern (if Southern=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.06	-	0	1
d_Southern Upper Ganga Plains	14396	0.24	-	0	1

(if Southern Upper Ganga Plains=1, Rest=0)					
Marital Status					
d_Unmarried ®					
d_Married, Widowed, Divorced/Separated (if Married/Widowed, Divorced/Separated=1, Unmarried=0)	14190	0.66	-	0	1
Relation to Head					
d_Others (Spouse of Head, Married Child, Spouse of Married Child, Unmarried Child, Grandchild, Father/Mother/Father-in-law/Mother-in-law/brother/sister/brother-in-law/sister-in-law/other relatives/servants/employees/other non-relatives)®					
d_Self [if Self=1, Rest(Others)=0]	14194	0.44	-	0	1
Land Possessed Code in Hectares					
d_Less than 0.005-0.01 (if Less than 0.005-0.01 =1, Rest=0)®					
d_0.02-1.00 (if 0.02-1.00=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.55	-	0	1
d_1.01-4.00 (if 1.01-4.00=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.19	-	0	1
d_4.01-Greater Than 8 (if 4.01-Greater Than 8=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.01	-	0	1
Educational Attainment					
d_Illiterates (if Illiterates=1, Rest=0) ®					
d_Upto Primary (if Upto Primary=1, Rest=0)	14194	0.20	-	0	1
d_Upto Secondary and Diploma Certificates (if Upto Secondary and Diploma Certificates=1, Rest=0)	14194	0.41	-	0	1
d_Graduates and Above (if Graduates and Above=1, Rest=0)	14194	0.04	-	0	1
Household Size					
d_1-3 (if 1-3=1, Rest=0)®					
d_4-7 (if 4-7=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.54	-	0	1
d_8-11 (if 8-11=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.25	-	0	1
d_12-24 (if 12-24=1, Rest=0)	14396	0.07	-	0	1
d_Dummy Variables and ® Reference Category					

Notes: for dummy variable the means give the number of positive values
CV, coefficient of variation